arXiv:1510.00379v1 [math.AP] 1 Oct 2015

KOLMOGOROV'S DISSIPATION NUMBER AND THE NUMBER OF DEGREES OF FREEDOM FOR THE 3D NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS

ALEXEY CHESKIDOV AND MIMI DAI

Abstract. Kolmogorov's theory of turbulence predicts that only wavenumbers bellow some critical value, called Kolmogorov's dissipation number, are essential to describe the evolution of a three-dimensional fluid flow. A determining wavenumber, first introduced by Foias and Prodi for the 2D Navier-Stokes equations, is a mathematical analog of Kolmogorov's number. The purpose of this paper is to prove the existence of a time-dependent determining wavenumber for the 3D Navier-Stokes equations whose time average is bounded by Kolmogorov's dissipation wavenumber for all solutions on the global attractor whose intermittency is not extreme.

KEY WORDS: Navier-Stokes equations, determining modes, global attractor.

CLASSIFICATION CODE: 35Q35, 37L30.

1. Introduction

The Navier-Stokes equations (NSE) on a torus $\mathbb{Z}^3$ are given by

$$\begin{cases} u_t + (u\cdot\nabla)u - \nu\Delta u + \nabla p = f \\ \nabla\cdot u = 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where u is the velocity, p is the pressure, and f is the external force. We assume that f has zero mean, and consider zero mean solutions. We also assume that $f \in H^{-1}$ or f is translationally bounded in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, H^{-1})$.

In this paper we investigate the number of degrees of freedom of a three-dimensional fluid flow governed by (1.1). Kolmogorov's theory of turbulence [25] assumes that there is a wavenumber $\kappa_{\rm d}$ above which the viscous forces dominate. This suggests that the frequencies above $\kappa_{\rm d}$ should not affect the dynamics and the number of degrees of freedom is of order $\kappa_{\rm d}^3$. A natural question is whether this can be justified mathematically.

The notion of determining modes, which allows us to define the degrees of freedom mathematically, was introduced by Foias and Prodi in [17] where they showed that high modes of a solution to the 2D NSE are controlled by low modes asymptotically as time goes to infinity. Then the number of these determining modes was estimated by Foias, Manley, Temam, and Treve [16] and later improved by Jones and Titi [24]. We refer the readers to [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21] and references therein for more background and related results.

In this paper we are concerned with 3D flows governed by (1.1), for which the existence of regular solutions is one of the Millennium open questions. Therefore, we

The authors were partially supported by NSF Grant DMS–1517583.

study weak solutions, whose existence was proved by Leray [26]. In [4], Cheskidov, Dai, and Kavlie proved the existence of a determining wavenumber $\Lambda_u(t)$, defined for each individual trajectory $u(t)$, whose average is uniformly bounded on the global attractor. More precisely, it was shown that two solutions $u(t)$ and $v(t)$ on the global attractor are identical, provided their projections below modes $\max\{\Lambda_u, \Lambda_v\}$ coincide. This recovered the results by Constantin, Foias, Manley, and Temam [11] in the case where $\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2$ is uniformly bounded on the global attractor, which is known for small forces. Moreover, when the force is large and the attractor is not a fixed point, but rather a complicated object consisting of complete bounded trajectories that may not be regular, the determining wavenumber Λ_u from [4] still enjoys the following pointwise bound

$$\Lambda_u(t) \lesssim \frac{\|\nabla u(t)\|_{L^2}^2}{\nu^2}. \tag{1.2}$$

Note that this bound is optimal (from the physical point of view) in the case of extreme intermittency, i.e., when there is only one eddy at each dyadic scale. Indeed, taking into account intermittency, Kolmogorov's dissipation wavenumber reads

$$\kappa_{\rm d} := \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\nu^3}\right)^{\frac{1}{d+1}}, \qquad \text{where} \qquad \varepsilon := \lambda_0^d \nu \langle \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \rangle = \frac{\lambda_0^d \nu}{T} \int_t^{t+T} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \, d\tau. \tag{1.3}$$

Combined with (1.2), this gives $\langle \Lambda_u \rangle \lesssim \kappa_{\rm d}$ when $d = 0$. Here $d \in [0, 3]$ is the intermittency dimension that measures the average number of eddies at various scales. Roughly speaking, the number of eddies at the lengthscale l is proportional to l^{-d} (see [10] for precice mathematical definitions of active volumes, eddies, and and their relations to intermittency). In this paper we adopt an approach used in [4, 7, 9] and define the itermittency dimension d through the average level of saturation of Bernstein's inequality (see Section 3 for the precise definition).

As experimental and numerical evidence suggests, turbulent flows do not deviate much from Kolmogorov's regime where $d = 3$, i.e., eddies occupy the whole region. In [4] it was shown that one can improve (1.2) for $d > 0$, but such an improvement was not enough to conclude that the average determining wavenumber was bounded by κ_d. For instance, in the case $d = 3$, the obtained bound was $\langle \Lambda_u \rangle \lesssim \kappa_{\rm d}^{2+}$, which suggested that the definition of Λ_u was not optimal in the physically relevant regime. In this paper we complement the result of [4] by focusing on the region $d \in (\delta, 3]$, $\delta > 0$, and finding a different determining wavenumber Λ_u that enjoys the optimal bound $\langle \Lambda_u \rangle \lesssim \kappa_{\rm d}$ (modulo a logarithmic correction in the case $d = 3$).

We define a determining wavenumber in the following way:

$$\Lambda_u(t) := \min\{\lambda_q : (L\lambda_{p-q})^{\frac{\delta-1}{2}} \lambda_q^{-1} \|u_p\|_{L^\infty} < c_0\nu, \ \forall p > q \text{ and } \lambda_q^{-2} \|\nabla u_{\le q}\|_{L^\infty} < c_0\nu, \ q \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

where $\delta > 0$ is a fixed (small) parameter, and c_0 is an adimensional constant that depends only on δ. In fact, $c_0 \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$. Here $\lambda_q = \frac{2^q}{L}$, L is the size of the torus, and $u_q = \Delta_q u$ is the Littlewood-Paley projection of u (see Section 2).

Now we are ready to state our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $u(t)$ and $v(t)$ be complete (ancient) bounded in L^2 Leray-Hopf solutions (i.e., solutions on the global attractor or pullback attractor). Let $\Lambda(t) := \max\{\Lambda_u(t), \Lambda_v(t)\}$ and $Q(t)$ be such that $\Lambda(t) = \lambda_{Q(t)}$. If*

$$u(t)_{\le Q(t)} = v(t)_{\le Q(t)}, \qquad \forall t < 0, \tag{1.4}$$

then

$$u(t) = v(t), \qquad \forall t \le 0.$$

The dissipation wavenumber Λ_u enjoys the following bound:

$$\langle \Lambda_u \rangle - \lambda_0 \le C_{\delta,d}\kappa_{\mathrm{d}} \le C_{\delta,d}\kappa_0 G^{\frac{2}{d+1}} \left(\frac{1}{\nu^2 T \kappa_0^2} + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{d+1}},$$

for all complete bounded in L^2 Leray-Hopf solutions with $d \in [\delta, 3)$. Here $C_{\delta,d}$ is an adimensional constant that blows up when $\delta \to 0$ or $d \to 3$. The bound is also written in terms on the adimensional Grashof number defined as $G := \|f\|_{H^{-1}}/(\nu^2 \kappa_0^{1/2})$ in the autonomous case (see (3.8) for the nonautonomous case).

In Kolmogorov's regime where $d = 3$ we also obtain the optimal bound, but with a logarithmic correction:

$$\left\langle \frac{\Lambda_u - \lambda_0}{(\log(\Lambda_u \lambda_0))^{\frac{1}{4}}} \right\rangle \le \widetilde{C}_\delta \kappa_{\mathrm{d}} \le \widetilde{C}_\delta \kappa_0 G^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\nu^2 T \kappa_0^2} + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

for all complete bounded in L^2 Leray-Hopf solutions with $d = 3$. Here $\widetilde{C}_\delta$ is an adimensional constant that depends only on the parameter δ in the definition of Λ (it in fact blows up when $\delta \to 0$).

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Notation.** We denote by $A \lesssim B$ an estimate of the form $A \le CB$ with some absolute constant C, by $A \sim B$ an estimate of the form $C_1 B \le A \le C_2 B$ with some absolute constants C_1, C_2, and by $A \lesssim_r B$ an estimate of the form $A \le C_r B$ with some adimentional constant C_r that depends only on the parameter r. We write $\|\cdot\|_p = \|\cdot\|_{L^p}$, and $(\cdot,\cdot)$ stands for the L^2-inner product. We will also use $\langle\cdot\rangle$ for time averages:

$$\langle g \rangle(t) := \frac{1}{T} \int_t^{t+T} g(\tau)\, d\tau,$$

for some fixed $T > 0$.

2.2. **Littlewood-Paley decomposition.** The techniques presented in this paper rely strongly on the Littlewood-Paley decomposition. Thus we here recall the Littlewood-Paley decomposition theory briefly. For a more detailed description on this theory we refer the readers to the books by Bahouri, Chemin and Danchin [1] and Grafakos [23].

We denote $\lambda_q = \frac{2^q}{L}$ for integers q. A nonnegative radial function $\chi \in c_r^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is chosen such that

$$\chi(\xi) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } |\xi| \le \frac{3}{4} \\ 0, & \text{for } |\xi| \ge 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

Let

$$\varphi(\xi) := \chi(\xi/2) - \chi(\xi)$$

and

$$\varphi_q(\xi) := \begin{cases} \varphi(2^{-q}\xi) & \text{for } q \ge 0, \\ \chi(\xi) & \text{for } q = -1, \end{cases}$$

so that the sequence of φ_q forms a dyadic partition of unity. Given a tempered distribution vector field u on $\mathbb{T}^3 = [0, L]^3$ and $q \geq -1$, an integer, the qth Littlewood-Paley projection of u is given by

$$u_q(x) := \Delta_q u(x) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} \hat{u}(k)\phi_q(k)e^{i\frac{2\pi}{L}k\cdot x},$$

where $\hat{u}(k)$ is the kth Fourier coefficient of u. Note that $u_{-1} = \hat{u}(0)$. Then

$$u = \sum_{q=-1}^{\infty} u_q$$

in the distributional sense. We define the H^s-norm in the following way:

$$\|u\|_{H^s} := \left(\sum_{q=-1}^{\infty} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_q\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

for each $u \in H^s$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\|u\|_{H^0} \sim \|u\|_{L^2}$. To simplify the notation, we denote

$$u_{\leq Q} := \sum_{q=-1}^{Q} u_q, \quad u_{(P,Q]} := \sum_{q=P+1}^{Q} u_q, \quad \tilde{u}_q := u_{q-1} + u_q + u_{q+1}.$$

2.3. **Bernstein's inequality and Bony's paraproduct.** Here we recall useful properties for the dyadic blocks of the Littlewood-Paley decomposition. The first one is the following inequality:

Lemma 2.1. *(Bernstein's inequality) Let n be the spacial dimension and $r \geq s \geq 1$. Then for all tempered distributions u,*

$$\|u_q\|_r \lesssim \lambda_q^{n(\frac{1}{s}-\frac{1}{r})} \|u_q\|_s. \tag{2.6}$$

Secondly, we will use the following version of Bony's paraproduct formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_q(u \cdot \nabla v) = &\sum_{|q-p|\leq 2} \Delta_q(u_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla v_p) + \sum_{|q-p|\leq 2} \Delta_q(u_p \cdot \nabla v_{\leq p-2}) \\ &+ \sum_{p \geq q-2} \Delta_q(\tilde{u}_p \cdot \nabla v_p).\end{aligned}$$

2.4. **Weak solutions and energy inequality.** A weak solution $u(t)$ of (1.1) on $[0, \infty)$ is an $L^2(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ valued function in the class $u \in C([0, \infty); L^2_{\mathrm{w}}) \cap L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(0, \infty; H^1)$ that satisfies (1.1) in the sense of distributions. A Leray-Hopf solution $u(t)$ is a weak solution satisfying the energy inequality

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u(t)\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u(t_0)\|_2^2 - \nu \int_{t_0}^{t} \|\nabla u(\tau)\|_2^2 \, d\tau + \int_{t_0}^{t} (f, u) \, d\tau, \tag{2.7}$$

for almost all $t_0 > 0$ and all $t > t_0$. A Leray solution $u(t)$ is a Leray-Hopf solution satisfying the above energy inequality for $t_0 = 0$ and all $t > t_0$. A complete Leray-Hopf solution $u(t)$ is an $L^2(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ valued function on $(-\infty, \infty)$, such that $u(\cdot - t)|_{[0,\infty)}$ is a Leray-Hopf solution for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

3. Global attractor, pullback attractor, and Kolmogorov's wavenumber

In the case of a time-independent force f it can be shown that the energy inequality (2.7) implies the existence of an absorbing ball

$$B := \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3) : \|u\|_2 \leq R\}.$$

Here the radius R is such that

$$R > \nu\kappa_0^{-1/2}G,$$

where $\kappa_0 = 2\pi\lambda_0 = 2\pi/L$ and G is the adimensional Grashof number

$$G := \frac{\|f\|_{H^{-1}}}{\nu^2\kappa_0^{1/2}}.$$

Note that the absorbing ball B is for all the Leray solutions, i.e., the ones that satisfy the energy inequality starting from 0. More precisely, for any Leray solution $u(t)$ there exists t_0, depending only on $\|u(0)\|_2$, such that

$$u(t) \in B \qquad \forall t > t_0.$$

However, when we restrict the dynamics to the absorbing ball, we consider Leray-Hopf solutions to define the evolutionary system and the global attractor. The Leray-Hopf solutions are weak solutions satisfying the energy inequality starting from almost all time (but not necessarily 0). Hence, a restriction of a Leray-Hopf solution to a smaller time interval is also a Leray-Hopf solution. See [8] for a more detailed discussion.

The existence of the weak global attractor $\mathcal{A}$ was proved in [18, 15]. It has the following structure:

$$\mathcal{A} = \{u(0) : u(\cdot) \text{ is a complete bounded Leray-Hopf solution to the NSE}\}.$$

The attractor $\mathcal{A} \subset B$ is the L^2-weak omega limit of B, and it is the minimal L^2-weakly closed weakly attracting set (see [2, 6]).

In the case of a time-dependent force $f = f(t)$, a relevant object describing the long-time dynamics is a pullback attractor, whose existence was proved in [8]. In the nonautonomous case, there exists an absorbing ball for all the Leray solutions, whose radius R is such as $R > \nu\kappa_0^{-1/2}G$, just as in the autonomous case, but the Grashof number is

$$G = \frac{T^{\frac{1}{2}}\kappa_0^{\frac{1}{2}}\|f\|_{L^2_b(T)}}{\nu^{\frac{3}{2}}(1 - e^{-\nu\kappa_0^2 T})^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \tag{3.8}$$

Here it is assumed that f is translationally bounded in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, H^{-1})$ and

$$\|f\|^2_{L^2_b(T)} := \sup_{t\in R} \frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \|f(\tau)\|^2_{H^{-1}}\, d\tau.$$

The pullback attractor is defined as the minimal weakly closed weakly pullback attracting set for all Leray-Hopf solutions in the absorbing ball. It is the weak pullback omega limit of B, and it has the following structure (see [8]):

$$\mathcal{A}(t) = \{u(t) : u(\cdot) \text{ is a complete bounded Leray-Hopf solution to the NSE}\}.$$

Let $u(t)$ be a complete bounded Leray-Hopf solution to the NSE. Then the energy inequality (2.7) implies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \le \|u(t+T)\|_2^2 &\le \limsup_{\tau\to t+} \|u(\tau)\|_2^2 - 2\nu\int_t^{t+T} \|\nabla u(\tau)\|_2^2\,d\tau + 2\int_t^{t+T}(f,u)\,d\tau \\ &\le \nu\kappa_0^{-1}G^2 - \nu\int_t^{t+T}\|\nabla u(\tau)\|_2^2\,d\tau + \frac{1}{\nu}\int_t^{t+T}\|f\|_{H^{-1}}^2\,d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\|\nabla u\|_2^2\rangle := \frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T}\|\nabla u(t)\|_2^2\,dt &\le \frac{G^2}{T\kappa_0} + \frac{\|f\|_{H^{-1}}^2}{\nu^2} \\ &\le \frac{G^2}{T\kappa_0} + \kappa_0\nu^2G^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

We can now connect this to Kolmogorov's dissipation wavenumber defined as

$$\kappa_{\rm d} := \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\nu^3}\right)^{\frac{1}{d+1}}, \qquad \varepsilon := \nu\lambda_0^d\langle\|\nabla u\|_2^2\rangle, \tag{3.10}$$

where d is the intermittency dimension and ε is average energy dissipation rate per unit active volume (i.e., the volume occupied by eddies). In order to define d, first note that

$$\lambda_0^3\lambda_q^{-1}\|u_q\|_2^2 \le \lambda_q^{-1}\|u_q\|_\infty^2 \le C_{\rm B}\lambda_q^2\|u_q\|_2^2, \tag{3.11}$$

due to Bernstein's inequality. Here C_B is an absolute constant (which depends on the choice of $\chi(\xi)$ in (2.5)). The intermittency dimension d is defined as

$$d := \sup\left\{ s\in\mathbb{R} : \left\langle \sum_q \lambda_q^{-1+s}\|u_q\|_\infty^2 \right\rangle \le C_{\rm B}^{3-s}\lambda_0^s \left\langle \sum_q \lambda_q^2\|u_q\|_2^2 \right\rangle \right\}, \tag{3.12}$$

for $u \not\equiv 0$, and $d = 3$ for $u \equiv 0$ on $[t, t+T]$. Thanks to (3.11) and the fact that $\langle\sum_q \lambda_q^2\|u_q\|_2^2\rangle < \infty$, we have $d \in [0,3]$ and

$$\left\langle \sum_q \lambda_q^{-1+d}\|u_q\|_\infty^2 \right\rangle = C_{\rm B}^{3-d}\lambda_0^d \left\langle \sum_q \lambda_q^2\|u_q\|_2^2 \right\rangle.$$

The intermittency dimension d, defined in terms of a level of saturation of Bernsten's inequality (see [9, 10] for similar definitions), measures the number of eddies at various scales. The case $d = 3$ corresponds to Kolmogorov's regime where at each scale the eddies occupy the whole region. Note that $d = d(u,t)$ and $\kappa_{\rm d} = \kappa_{\rm d}(u,t)$, defined for each individual trajectory, are functions of time. We can also define their global analogs as

$$D := \inf_{u\in\mathcal{E},t\in\mathbb{R}} d(u,t), \qquad K_{\rm d} := \sup_{u\in\mathcal{E},t\in\mathbb{R}} \kappa_{\rm d}(u,t).$$

Here $\mathcal{E}$ is a family of all complete bounded Leray-Hopf solution to the NSE.

Finally, thanks to the bound (3.9),

$$\kappa_{\rm d} = \left\langle \frac{\lambda_0^d}{\nu^2}\|\nabla u\|_2^2 \right\rangle^{\frac{1}{d+1}} \le \kappa_0 G^{\frac{2}{d+1}}\left(\frac{1}{\nu^2T\kappa_0^2}+1\right)^{\frac{1}{d+1}}.$$

Also, taking the supremum over all $u\in\mathcal{E}$ and $t\in\mathbb{R}$, we obtain

$$K_{\rm d} \le \kappa_0 G^{\frac{2}{D+1}}\left(\frac{1}{\nu^2T\kappa_0^2}+1\right)^{\frac{1}{D+1}},$$

provided $G \geq 1$.

4. Proof of the main result

Let $u(t)$ and $v(t)$ be complete bounded in L^2 Leray-Hopf solutions. Denote $w := u - v$, which satisfies the equation

$$w_t + u \cdot \nabla w + w \cdot \nabla v = -\nabla \pi + \nu \Delta w \tag{4.13}$$

in the sense of distributions.

Recall the definition of the determining wavenumber:

$$\Lambda_u(t) = \min\{\lambda_q : (L\lambda_{p-q})^\sigma \lambda_q^{-1} \|u_p\|_{L^\infty} < c_0\nu,\ \forall p > q \text{ and } \lambda_q^{-2}\|\nabla u_{\leq q}\|_{L^\infty} < c_0\nu,\ q \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

where $\sigma = (\delta - 1)/2$. Let $\Lambda(t) := \max\{\Lambda_u(t), \Lambda_v(t)\}$ and $Q(t)$ be such that $\Lambda(t) = \lambda_{Q(t)}$. By our assumption, $w_{\leq Q(t)}(t) \equiv 0$. Recall that $\delta > 0$, i.e., $\sigma > -1/2$. Let

$$s = \min\left\{-\tfrac{1}{2} + \tfrac{\delta}{4}, 0\right\}.$$

Then $-1 - \sigma < s < \sigma$.

Multiplying (4.13) by $\lambda_q^{2s}\Delta_q^2 w$, integrating, and adding up for all $q \geq -1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\|w(t)\|_{H^s}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|w(t_0)\|_{H^s}^2 + \nu\int_{t_0}^t \|w\|_{H^{1+s}}^2\, d\tau \\
\leq& -\int_{t_0}^t \sum_{q\geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Delta_q(w\cdot\nabla v) w_q\, dx\, d\tau \\
&-\int_{t_0}^t \sum_{q\geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Delta_q(u\cdot\nabla w) w_q\, dx\, d\tau, \\
=:& \int_{t_0}^t I\, d\tau + \int_{t_0}^t J\, d\tau.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

We first decompose I using Bony's paraproduct as mentioned in Subsection 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
I =& -\sum_{q\geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \sum_{|q-p|\leq 2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Delta_q(w_{\leq p-2}\cdot\nabla v_p) w_q\, dx \\
&-\sum_{q\geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \sum_{|q-p|\leq 2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Delta_q(w_p\cdot\nabla v_{\leq p-2}) w_q\, dx \\
&-\sum_{q\geq -1} \lambda_q^{2s} \sum_{p\geq q-2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Delta_q(\tilde{w}_p\cdot\nabla v_p) w_q\, dx \\
=:& I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_1| &\leq \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{|q-p|\leq 2\\ p>Q+2}} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |\Delta_q(w_{\leq p-2}\cdot\nabla v_p) w_q|\, dx \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{|q-p|\leq 2\\ p>Q+2}} \lambda_q^{2s} \|w_{(Q,p-2]}\|_2 \lambda_p \|v_p\|_\infty \|w_q\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of Λ, Young's inequality and Jensen's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_1| &\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{|q-p|\le 2\\ p>Q+2}} \lambda_q^{2s}\Lambda^{1+\sigma}\lambda_p^{1-\sigma}\|w_q\|_2 \sum_{Q<p'\le p-2}\|w_{p'}\|_2 \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{1+s}\|w_q\|_2 \left(\sum_{Q<p'\le q} \lambda_{p'}^{1+s}\|w_{p'}\|_2\lambda_{p'}^{-1-s}\lambda_q^{s-\sigma}\lambda_Q^{1+\sigma}\right) \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{1+s}\|w_q\|_2 \left(\sum_{Q<p'\le q} \lambda_{p'}^{1+s}\|w_{p'}\|_2(L\lambda_{q-p'})^{s-\sigma}\right) \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2+2s}\|w_q\|_2^2 + c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \left(\sum_{Q<p'\le q} \lambda_{p'}^{1+s}\|w_{p'}\|_2(L\lambda_{q-p'})^{s-\sigma}\right)^2 \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2+2s}\|w_q\|_2^2 + c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q}\sum_{Q<p'\le q} \lambda_{p'}^{2+2s}\|w_{p'}\|_2^2(L\lambda_{q-p'})^{s-\sigma} \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2+2s}\|w_q\|_2^2 + c_0\nu \sum_{p'>Q} \lambda_{p'}^{2+2s}\|w_{p'}\|_2^2 \sum_{q\ge p'}(L\lambda_{q-p'})^{s-\sigma} \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu\|\nabla^{1+s}w\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

where we needed $\sigma \ge -1$ and $s < \sigma$. Following the similarly strategy, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2| &\le \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{|q-p|\le 2\\ p>Q}} \lambda_q^{2s}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |\Delta_q(w_p\cdot\nabla v_{\le p-2})w_q|\,dx \\
&\le \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{|q-p|\le 2\\ p>Q}} \lambda_q^{2s}\|w_p\|_2\|\nabla v_{(Q,p-2]}\|_\infty\|w_q\|_2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{|q-p|\le 2\\ p>Q}} \lambda_q^{2s}\|w_p\|_2\|\nabla v_{\le Q}\|_\infty\|w_q\|_2 \\
&\equiv I_{21} + I_{22}
\end{aligned}$$

where we adopt the convention that $(Q, p-2]$ is empty if $p-2 \le Q$. Thus, the first part of the definition of Λ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{21} &\lesssim \sum_{p>Q}\sum_{|q-p|\le 2} \lambda_q^{2s}\|w_p\|_2\|w_q\|_2 \sum_{Q<p'\le p-2}\|\nabla v_{p'}\|_\infty \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2s}\|w_q\|_2^2 \sum_{Q<p'\le q+2} \lambda_{p'}\|v_{p'}\|_\infty \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2s}\|w_q\|_2^2 \sum_{Q<p'\le q+2} \lambda_{p'}^{1-\sigma}\Lambda^{1+\sigma} \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2+2s}\|w_q\|_2^2 \sum_{Q<p'\le q+2} \lambda_{p'}^{1-\sigma}\Lambda^{1+\sigma}\lambda_q^{-2} \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2+2s}\|w_q\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

where we need $\sigma \geq -1$. While the second part of the definition of Λ gives

$$\begin{aligned} I_{22} &\lesssim \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{|q-p|\leq 2 \\ p>Q}} \lambda_q^{2s} \|w_p\|_2 \|w_q\|_2 \|\nabla v_{\leq Q}\|_\infty \\ &\lesssim c_0 \nu \sum_{q>Q} \Lambda_v^2 \lambda_q^{2s} \|w_q\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim c_0 \nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2+2s} \|w_q\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

We will now estimate I_3. It follows from integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_3| &\leq \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{p\geq q-2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |\Delta_q(\tilde{w}_p \otimes v_p) \nabla w_q| \, dx \\ &\leq \sum_{p>Q} \sum_{Q<q\leq p+2} \lambda_q^{1+2s} \|\tilde{w}_p\|_2 \|w_q\|_2 \|v_p\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality, definition of Λ, Young's inequality and Jensen's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_3| &\lesssim \sum_{p>Q} \|\tilde{w}_p\|_2 \|v_p\|_\infty \sum_{Q<q\leq p+2} \lambda_q^{1+2s} \|w_q\|_2 \\ &\lesssim c_0 \nu \sum_{p>Q} \Lambda^{1+\sigma} \lambda_p^{-\sigma} \|\tilde{w}_p\|_2 \sum_{Q<q\leq p+2} \lambda_q^{1+2s} \|w_q\|_2 \\ &\lesssim c_0 \nu \sum_{p>Q} \lambda_p^{1+s} \|\tilde{w}_p\|_2 \sum_{Q<q\leq p+2} \lambda_q^{1+s} \|w_q\|_2 \lambda_Q^{1+\sigma} \lambda_p^{-1-s-\sigma} \lambda_q^s \\ &\lesssim c_0 \nu \sum_{p>Q} \lambda_p^{1+s} \|\tilde{w}_p\|_2 \sum_{Q<q\leq p+2} \lambda_q^{1+s} \|w_q\|_2 (L\lambda_{q-p})^{1+s+\sigma} \\ &\lesssim c_0 \nu \sum_{p>Q} \lambda_p^{2+2s} \|w_p\|_2^2 + c_0 \nu \sum_{p>Q} \left(\sum_{Q<q\leq p+2} \lambda_q^{1+s} \|w_q\|_2 (L\lambda_{q-p})^{1+s+\sigma} \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim c_0 \nu \sum_{p>Q} \lambda_p^{2+2s} \|w_p\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\sigma \geq -1$ and $s > -1 - \sigma$.

Therefore, we have for $\sigma \geq -1$ and $-1 - \sigma < s < \sigma$,

$$|I| \lesssim c_0 \nu \|\nabla^{1+s} w\|_2^2. \tag{4.15}$$

Applying Bony's paraproduct to J yields

$$\begin{aligned} J = &- \sum_{q\geq -1} \sum_{|q-p|\leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Delta_q (u_{\leq p-2} \cdot \nabla w_p) w_q \, dx \\ &- \sum_{q\geq -1} \sum_{|q-p|\leq 2} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Delta_q (u_p \cdot \nabla w_{\leq p-2}) w_q \, dx \\ &- \sum_{q\geq -1} \sum_{p\geq q-2} \sum_{|p-p'|\leq 1} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Delta_q (u_p \cdot \nabla w_{p'}) w_q \, dx \\ =: &J_1 + J_2 + J_3. \end{aligned}$$

We further decompose J_1 by using a commutator form

$$\begin{aligned}J_1 =& -\sum_{q\geq -1}\sum_{|q-p|\leq 2}\lambda_q^{2s}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}[\Delta_q, u_{\leq p-2}\cdot\nabla]w_p w_q\,dx\\ &-\sum_{q\geq -1}\lambda_q^{2s}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}u_{\leq q-2}\cdot\nabla w_q w_q\,dx\\ &-\sum_{q\geq -1}\sum_{|q-p|\leq 2}\lambda_q^{2s}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}(u_{\leq p-2}-u_{\leq q-2})\cdot\nabla\Delta_q w_p w_q\,dx\\ =&J_{11}+J_{12}+J_{13}.\end{aligned}$$

To obtain the second term, we used $\sum_{|p-q|\leq 2}\Delta_q w_p = w_q$. Actually we have $J_{12} = 0$, since $\operatorname{div} u_{\leq q-2} = 0$. In the first term, the commutator is defined as

$$[\Delta_q, u_{\leq p-2}\cdot\nabla]w_p := \Delta_q(u_{\leq p-2}\cdot\nabla w_p) - u_{\leq p-2}\cdot\nabla\Delta_q w_p.$$

It is easy to see that (see [5]) that for any $1\leq r\leq\infty$,

$$\|[\Delta_q, u_{\leq p-2}\cdot\nabla]w_p\|_r \lesssim \|\nabla u_{\leq p-2}\|_\infty\|w_p\|_r.$$

Then, J_{11} is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}|J_{11}| &\leq \sum_{q>Q}\sum_{\substack{|q-p|\leq 2\\ p>Q}}\lambda_q^{2s}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}|[\Delta_q, u_{\leq p-2}\cdot\nabla]w_p w_q|\,dx\\ &\leq \sum_{q>Q}\sum_{\substack{|q-p|\leq 2\\ p>Q}}\lambda_q^{2s}\|\nabla u_{(Q,p-2]}\|_\infty\|w_p\|_2\|w_q\|_2\\ &+\sum_{q>Q}\sum_{\substack{|q-p|\leq 2\\ p>Q}}\lambda_q^{2s}\|\nabla u_{\leq Q}\|_\infty\|w_p\|_2\|w_q\|_2\\ &\equiv J_{111}+J_{112},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}J_{111} &\lesssim \sum_{q>Q}\lambda_q^{2s}\|w_q\|_2^2\sum_{Q<p'\leq q}\lambda_{p'}\|u_{p'}\|_\infty\\ &\lesssim c_0\nu\sum_{q>Q}\lambda_q^{2s}\|w_q\|_2^2\sum_{Q<p'\leq q}\Lambda^{1+\sigma}\lambda_{p'}^{1-\sigma}\\ &\lesssim c_0\nu\sum_{q>Q}\lambda_q^{2+2s}\|w_q\|_2^2\sum_{Q<p'\leq q}\Lambda^{1+\sigma}\lambda_{p'}^{1-\sigma}\lambda_q^{-2}\\ &\lesssim c_0\nu\sum_{q>Q}\lambda_q^{2+2s}\|w_q\|_2^2\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\sigma\geq -1$.

Using the fact that $\|\nabla u_{\leq q}\|_\infty\leq c_0\nu\Lambda^2$ for $q\leq Q$, we obtain

$$J_{112}\lesssim c_0\nu\Lambda^2\sum_{q>Q}\lambda_q^{2s}\|w_q\|_2^2\lesssim c_0\nu\sum_{q>Q}\lambda_q^{2+2s}\|w_q\|_2^2.$$

While J_{13} is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_{13}| &\le \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{|q-p|\le 2\\ p>Q}} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |(u_{\le p-2} - u_{\le q-2}) \cdot \nabla \Delta_q w_p w_q| \, dx \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{1+2s} \|u_{(q-4,q]}\|_\infty \|w_q\|_2^2 \\
&\lesssim \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{1+2s} \|u_{(q-4,Q]}\|_\infty \|w_q\|_2^2 + \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{q-4<p'\le q\\ p'>Q}} \lambda_q^{1+2s} \|u_{p'}\|_\infty \|w_q\|_2^2 \\
&\equiv J_{131} + J_{132}.
\end{aligned}$$

As before, we adapt the convention that $(q-4, Q]$ is empty if $q - 4 \ge Q$. We have

$$J_{131} \lesssim c_0 \nu \Lambda \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{1+2s} \|w_q\|_2^2 \lesssim c_0 \nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2+2s} \|w_q\|_2^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{132} &= \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{q-4\le p'\le q\\ p'>Q}} \lambda_q^{1+2s} \|u_{p'}\|_\infty \|w_q\|_2^2 \\
&\lesssim c_0 \nu \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{q-4\le p'\le q\\ p'>Q}} \lambda_q^{1+2s} \Lambda^{1+\sigma} \lambda_{p'}^{-\sigma} \|w_q\|_2^2 \\
&\lesssim c_0 \nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2+2s} \|w_q\|_2^2 (L\lambda_{Q-q})^{1+\sigma} \\
&\lesssim c_0 \nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2+2s} \|w_q\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\sigma \ge -1$.

Now we continue with estimating J_2:

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_2| &\le \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{|q-p|\le 2\\ p>Q+2}} \lambda_q^{2s} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |\Delta_q (u_p \cdot \nabla w_{\le p-2}) w_q| \, dx \\
&\le \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{|q-p|\le 2\\ p>Q+2}} \lambda_q^{2s} \|u_p\|_\infty \|\nabla w_{(Q,p-2]}\|_2 \|w_q\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
|J_2| &\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \sum_{\substack{|q-p|\le 2\\ p>Q+2}} \lambda_q^{2s} \Lambda^{1+\sigma} \lambda_p^{-\sigma} \|w_q\|_2 \|\nabla w_{(Q,p-2]}\|_2 \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \Lambda^{1+\sigma} \lambda_q^{2s-\sigma} \|w_q\|_2 \|\nabla w_{(Q,q]}\|_2 \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \Lambda^{1+\sigma} \lambda_q^{2s-\sigma} \|w_q\|_2 \sum_{Q<p'\le q} \lambda_{p'} \|w_{p'}\|_2 \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{1+s} \|w_q\|_2 \sum_{Q<p'\le q} \lambda_{p'}^{1+s} \|w_{p'}\|_2 \lambda_q^{s-\sigma-1} \lambda_{p'}^{-s} \Lambda^{1+\sigma} \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{1+s} \|w_q\|_2 \left(\sum_{Q<p'\le q} \lambda_{p'}^{1+s} \|w_{p'}\|_2 (L\lambda_{q-p'})^{s-\sigma-1} \right) \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2+2s} \|w_q\|_2^2 + c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \left(\sum_{Q<p'\le q} \lambda_{p'}^{1+s} \|w_{p'}\|_2 (L\lambda_{q-p'})^{s-\sigma-1} \right)^2 \\
&\lesssim c_0\nu \sum_{q>Q} \lambda_q^{2+2s} \|w_q\|_2^2,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used $s < \sigma + 1$ and $\sigma \ge -1$.

Notice that the last term J_3 can be estimated as I_3. Therefore, we have for $\sigma \ge -1$ and $-1 - \sigma < s < 1 + \sigma$,

$$
|J| \lesssim c_0\nu \|\nabla^{1+s} w\|_2^2. \tag{4.16}
$$

Combining (4.15) and (4.16), we conclude that, for $\sigma \ge -1$ and $-1 - \sigma < s < \sigma$, there exists an adimensional constant $C > 0$ such that

$$
|I| + |J| \le C c_0 \nu \|\nabla^{1+s} w\|_2^2.
$$

Choosing $c_0 := 1/(2C)$ we infer from (4.14) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|w(t)\|_{H^s}^2 \le& \|w(t_0)\|_{H^s}^2 - \nu \int_{t_0}^t \|\nabla^{1+s} w\|_2^2 \, d\tau \\
\le& \|w(t_0)\|_{H^s}^2 - \nu \kappa_0^{2+2s} \int_{t_0}^t \|w\|_2^2 \, d\tau,
\end{aligned}
$$

with $\kappa_0 = \frac{2\pi}{L}$. Thus

$$
\|w(t)\|_{H^s}^2 \le \|w(t_0)\|_{H^s}^2 e^{-\nu\kappa_0^{2+2s}(t-t_0)}.
$$

Recall that $s \le 0$ and hence $\|w(t)\|_{H^s} \lesssim \lambda_0^s \|w(t)\|_2$, which is bounded. Then taking the limit as $t_0 \to \infty$ completes the proof.

□

5. Average determining wavenumber and Kolmogorov's dissipation wavenumber

The goal of this section is to derive a uniform upper bound on the average determining wavenumber in the absorbing ball. First, recall that $\Lambda_u(t)$ is defined as

$$
\Lambda_u(t) := \min\{\lambda_q : \lambda_{p-q}^{\sigma} \lambda_q^{-1} \|u_p\|_{L^\infty} < c_0\nu, \, \forall p > q \text{ and } \lambda_q^{-2} \|\nabla u_{\le q}\|_{L^\infty} < c_0\nu, \, q \in \mathbb{N}\},
$$

where $\sigma = (\delta - 1)/2$ and c_0 is an adimensional constant that depends only on δ. We will drop the subscript u in Λ_u and define Q so that $\lambda_Q = \Lambda$. Now note that whenever $\Lambda(t) > \lambda_0$, we have that one of the conditions in definition of $\Lambda_{u,r}$ is not satisfied for $q = Q - 1$, i.e.,

$$2^{(p-Q+1)\sigma}\lambda_{Q-1}^{-1}\|u_p\|_\infty \geq c_0\nu, \qquad \text{for some} \qquad p \geq Q, \tag{5.17}$$

or

$$\|\nabla u_{\leq Q-1}\|_\infty \geq c_0\nu\lambda_{Q-1}^2 = \tfrac{1}{4}c_0\nu\Lambda^2. \tag{5.18}$$

Thus we have

$$(c_0\nu)^2\Lambda^4 \leq 16(\lambda_{p-Q}L)^{2\sigma}\Lambda^2\|u_p\|_\infty^2, \qquad \text{for some} \qquad p \geq Q,$$

or

$$(c_0\nu)^2\Lambda^4 \leq 16\|\nabla u_{\leq Q-1}\|_\infty^2,$$

provided $\Lambda > \lambda_0$. Hence, adding the right hand sides, we obtain

$$(c_0\nu)^2(\Lambda - \lambda_0)^4 \lesssim \|\nabla u_{\leq Q-1}\|_\infty^2 + \sup_{p\geq Q}(L\lambda_{p-Q})^{2\sigma}\Lambda^2\|u_p\|_\infty^2. \tag{5.19}$$

We will now consider the average determining wavenumber

$$\langle\Lambda\rangle := \frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T}\Lambda(\tau)\,d\tau,$$

and compare it to Kolmogorov's dissipation wavenumber defined as

$$\kappa_{\mathrm{d}} := \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\nu^3}\right)^{\frac{1}{d+1}}, \qquad \varepsilon := \nu\lambda_0^d\langle\|\nabla u\|_2^2\rangle = \frac{\nu\lambda_0^d}{T}\int_t^{t+T}\|\nabla u(\tau)\|_2^2\,d\tau, \tag{5.20}$$

where $d \in [0, 3]$ is the intermittency dimension and ε is average energy dissipation rate per unit active volume (i.e., the volume occupied by eddies). Recall from the definition of intermittency (5.21) that

$$\langle\sum_{q\leq Q}\lambda_q^{-1+d}\|u_q\|_\infty^2\rangle \lesssim \lambda_0^d\langle\sum_{q\leq Q}\lambda_q^2\|u_q\|_2^2\rangle. \tag{5.21}$$

The case $d = 3$ corresponds to Kolmogorov's regime where at each scale the eddies occupy the whole region, and $d = 0$ is the case of extreme intermittency.

Consider now a solution u for which $d \geq \delta$, i.e., $d \geq 2\sigma + 1$. Using (5.19) and Jensen's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\Lambda\rangle - \lambda_0 &\lesssim \langle(\Lambda - \lambda_0)^{d+1}\rangle^{\frac{1}{d+1}} \\
&\lesssim \left\langle\frac{\Lambda^{d-3}}{(c_0\nu)^2}\left(\|\nabla u_{\leq Q-1}\|_\infty^2 + \sup_{q\geq Q}(L\lambda_{q-Q})^{2\sigma}\Lambda^2\|u_q\|_\infty^2\right)\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{d+1}} \\
&\lesssim \left\langle\frac{1}{\nu^2}\left(\sum_{q\leq Q-1}\lambda_q^{(d-1)/2}\|u_q\|_\infty(L\lambda_{Q-q})^{(d-3)/2}\right)^2 + \frac{\Lambda^{d-1}}{\nu^2}\sup_{q\geq Q}(L\lambda_{q-Q})^{2\sigma}\|u_q\|_\infty^2\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{d+1}} \\
&\lesssim_d \left\langle\frac{1}{\nu^2}\sum_{q\leq Q-1}\lambda_q^{d-1}\|u_q\|_\infty^2 + \frac{1}{\nu^2}\sup_{q\geq Q}(L\lambda_{q-Q})^{2\sigma-d+1}\lambda_q^{d-1}\|u_q\|_\infty^2\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{d+1}} \\
&\lesssim_d \left\langle\frac{1}{\nu^2}\sum_q\lambda_q^{d-1}\|u_q\|_\infty^2\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{d+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now using (5.21) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \Lambda\rangle - \lambda_0 &\lesssim_d \left\langle \frac{1}{\nu^2}\sum_{q\le Q}\lambda_q^{d-1}\|u_q\|_\infty^2\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{d+1}}\\ &\lesssim \left\langle \frac{\lambda_0^d}{\nu^2}\sum_{q\le Q}\lambda_q^2\|u_q\|_2^2\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{d+1}}\\ &\lesssim \left\langle \frac{\nu\lambda_0^d}{\nu^3}\|\nabla u\|_2^2\right\rangle^{\frac{1}{d+1}}\\ &= \kappa_{\rm d}\end{aligned}$$

Consider now Kolmogorov's regime where $d = 3$. Then a similar computation yields

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle \frac{\Lambda-\lambda_0}{(\log(\Lambda\lambda_0))^{\frac14}}\right\rangle &\lesssim \left\langle \frac{(\Lambda-\lambda_0)^4}{Q}\right\rangle^{\frac14}\\ &\lesssim \left\langle Q\left(\frac{1}{c_0\nu Q}\sum_{q\le Q}\|\nabla u_q\|_\infty\right)^2 + \sup_{p\ge Q}(L\lambda_{p-Q})^{2\sigma}\Lambda^2\|u_p\|_\infty^2\right\rangle^{\frac14}\\ &\lesssim \left\langle \frac{1}{\nu^2}\sum_{q\le Q}\lambda_q^2\|u_q\|_\infty^2 + \frac{1}{\nu^2}\sup_{q\ge Q}(L\lambda_{q-Q})^{2\sigma-2}\lambda_q^2\|u_q\|_\infty^2\right\rangle^{\frac14}\\ &\lesssim \left\langle \frac{\lambda_0^3}{\nu^2}\sum_q\lambda_q^2\|u_q\|_2^2\right\rangle^{\frac14}\\ &\lesssim \kappa_{\rm d}.\end{aligned}$$

References

[1] H. Bahouri, J. Chemin, and R. Danchin. *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*. Grundlehrender Mathematischen Wissenschaften, 343. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.

[2] A. Cheskidov. *Global attractors of evolutionary systems*. Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations, 21: 249–268, 2009.

[3] A. Cheskidov, P. Constantin, S. Friedlander and R. Shvydkoy. *Energy conservation and Onsager's conjecture for the Euler equations*. Nonlinearity, 21: 1233–1252, 2008.

[4] A. Cheskidov and M. Dai. *Determining modes for the 3D Navier-Stokes equations*. arXiv:1507.05908, 2015.

[5] A. Cheskidov and M. Dai. *Determining modes for the surface Quasi-Geostrophic equation*. arXiv:1507.01075, 2015.

[6] A. Cheskidov and C. Foias. *On global attractors of the 3D Navier-Stokes equations*. J. Differential Equations, Vol. 231, (2): 714–754, 2006.

[7] Al. Cheskidov and S. Friedlander. *The vanishing viscosity limit for a dyadic model*. Phys. D, 238(8):783–787, 2009.

[8] A. Cheskidov and L. Kavlie. *Pullback attractors for generilized evolutionary systems*.

[9] A. Cheskidov and R. Shvydkoy. *A unified approach to regularity problems for the 3D Navier-Stokes and Euler equations: the use of Kolmogorov's dissipation range*. J. Math. Fluid Mech., 16:263–273, 2014.

[10] A. Cheskidov and R. Shvydkoy. *Euler Equations and Turbulence: Analytical Approach to Intermittency*. SIAM J. Math. Anal., 46(1), 353–374, 2014.

[11] P. Constantin, C. Foias, O. P. Manley, and R. Temam. *Determining modes and fractal dimension of turbulent flows*. J. Fluid Mech., 150:427–440, 1985.
[12] P. Constantin, C. Foias, and R. Temam. *On the dimension of the attractors in two-dimensional turbulence*. Physica D, 30, 284–296, 1988.
[13] C. Foias, M. Jolly, R. Kravchenko and E. Titi. *A determining form for the 2D Navier-Stokes equations – the Fourier modes case*. J. Math. Phys., 53(11), 115623, 30 pp, 2012.
[14] C. Foias, M. Jolly, R. Kravchenko and E. Titi. *A unified approach to determining forms for the 2D Navier-Stokes equations – the general interpolants case*. Russ. Math. Surv. 69, 359, 2014.
[15] C. Foias, O. Manley, R. Rosa, and R. Temam. *Navier-Stokes equations and turbulence*. Vol. 83 of Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
[16] C. Foias, O. P. Manley, R Temam, and Y. M. Tréve. *Asymptotic analysis of the Navier-Stokes equations*. Phys. D, 9(1-2), 157–188, 1983.
[17] C. Foias and G. Prodi. *Sur le comportement global des solutions non-stationnaires des équations de Navier–Stokes en dimension 2*. Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova 39:1–34, 1967.
[18] C. Foias and R. Temam. *Some analytic and geometric properties of the solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*. J. Math. Pures Appl., 58, 339–368, 1979.
[19] C. Foias and R. Temam. *Determination of the solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations by a set of nodal values*. Math. Comput., 43, 117–133, 1984.
[20] C. Foias and R. Temam. *The connection between the Navier-Stokes equations,and turbulence theory*. Directions in Partial Differential Equations, Publ. Math. Res. Center Univ. Wisconsin, 55-73, 1985.
[21] C. Foias and E. S. Titi. *Determining nodes, finite difference schemes and inertial manifolds*. Nonlinearity, 135–153, 1991.
[22] U. Frisch. *Turbulence: The legacy of A. N. Kolmogorov*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
[23] L. Grafakos. *Modern Fourier Analysis*. Second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 250. Springer, New York, 2009.
[24] D. A. Jones and E. S. Titi. *Upper bounds on the number of determining modes, nodes, and volume elements for the Navier-Stokes equations*. Indiana Univ. Math. J. 42(3):875–887, 1993.
[25] A. N. Kolmogorov. *The local structure of turbulence in incompressible viscous fluids at very large Reynolds numbers*. Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR 30: 301?305, 1941.
[26] J. Leray. *Sur le mouvement dun liquide visqueux emplissant lespace*. Acta Math. 63(1):193–248, 1934
[27] R. Temam. *Navier-Stokes Equations: Theory and Numerical Analysis* . AMS Chelsea, Providence, Rhode Island, 2000.

Department of Mathematics, Stat. and Comp.Sci., University of Illinois Chicago, Chicago, IL 60607,USA
E-mail address: acheskid@uic.edu

Department of Applied Mathematics, Stat. and Comp.Sci., University of Illinois Chicago, Chicago, IL 60607,USA
E-mail address: mdai@uic.edu